UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/797,695	03/10/2004	Ziv Haparnas	1005-09-01 USP	4321

42698 7590 03/17/2009

CENTURY IP GROUP, INC. [Main]
P.O. BOX 7333
NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92658-7333

EXAMINER	
RICHARDSON, THOMAS W	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2444	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/17/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/797,695	HAPARNAS, ZIV	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	THOMAS RICHARDSON	2444	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 December 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-9,11 and 13-19* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1, 3-9, 11, and 13-19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

20050096029, page 4, paragraph 63-70, forward based on data type

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1, 3-9, 11, and 13-19 are pending for examination.

Claims 1 and 11 are amended.

Claims 2, 10, 12, and 20 are cancelled.

Claims 1, 3-9, 11, and 13-19 are rejected.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 11 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9, 11, 13, 14, and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over uReach.com, “the all-in-one communications service” (hereinafter uReach) and US 6 950 650, Roeder.

4. As per claim 1, uReach teaches a method of managing telephony events associated with a mobile device from a general-purpose computer, the method comprising:

monitoring first data directed to the mobile device over a wireless communications network, wherein the first data causes the mobile device to execute one or more first telephony events (page 1, where the calls for a phone number may be

routed to a cell phone, also page 2, where a notification of a new message may be sent via page or a phone call);

determining whether the first data belongs to one or more predetermined categories of data designed to be forwarded to the general-purpose computer (page 1, where a voice mail call may be directed for listening over a PC)

generating second data from the first data, in response to determining that the second data is needed to cause the general-purpose computer to execute one or more second telephony events that are equivalent or similar to the one or more first telephony events that are designed for execution on the mobile device (page 1, where a voicemail message may be directed for listening over a PC if the call is not taken by the first device, which may be a cell phone, also page 2, where notifications may be sent to various devices using various methods, such as email or instant message);

forwarding the first data or, where needed, the second data to the general-purpose computer, in response to determining that the first data belongs to the one or more predetermined categories (page 1, where a voicemail message may be directed for listening over a PC if the call is not taken by the first device);

wherein the general-purpose computer receives the first or the second data and executes the one or more second telephony events using additional resources available on the general-purpose computer which are not available on the mobile device (page 1, where a voicemail message may be directed for listening over a PC is the call is not taken by the first device. Also page 2, where access may take place in different forms,

such as over the phone or over the web, showing that different resources may be used between devices).

uReach does not expressly teach that the second device may be used to respond to the telephony event in real time, only receive messages. Roeder teaches a system for call forwarding comprising:

a general purpose computer receiving and executing a second data in response to a first data directed toward a first device allowing a user to access or respond to the one or more second telephony events in real time (column 7, lines also, column 6, lines 28-29, where telephone may be a computer telephone or a wireless mobile station).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize call forwarding to multiple devices as taught by Roeder in a call forwarding system such as uReach. uReach generally allows a user to set up call forwarding, such that calls directed toward a number may be forwarded to a plurality of devices (page 1). It would have been obvious to forward calls to multiple devices such as taught by Roeder, as uReach already allows for a user to forward to multiple devices. uReach's method would benefit, as forwarding a call to multiple devices at once would allow a user a greater level of access, as any of the devices could receive and respond to the call. Roeder allows the call to be forwarded to a computer acting as a telephone (column 6, lines 28-29), which would provide a forwarding system such as that taught by uReach with the obvious benefit of allowing the system to forward telephone calls to a computer system acting as a telephone such that a user may respond to the call.

5. As per claim 3, uReach further teaches forwarding the first or second data to the general-purpose computer directly over an IP based connection (page 2, where access may come from a Web-enabled device or over the Web by a PC (as is page 1, where voicemail may be accessed by a PC. It is well-known in the art that the Internet is an IP based network, so using the IP protocol is inherent when using a PC over the Web).

6. As per claim 4, uReach further teaches forwarding the first or second data to the general purpose computer directly over a TCP/IP based connection (page 2, where a notification may be sent via email, which is commonly known in the art to utilize TCP connections, as is the case with POP and SMTP).

7. As per claim 6, Roeder further teaches the notification is forwarded by way of a server device connecting the first and second devices over a wired Internet connection (Figure 1, where the connections are wired connections).

8. As per claim 7, uReach further teaches that the server device performs the step of generating the second data (page 2, where the notification originates from the uReach.com account and is delivered to the devices).

9. As per claim 8, uReach further teaches that the one or more predetermined categories defines a set of executable telephony events (page 1, where messages may be voicemail messages).

10. As per claim 9, Roeder further teaches the set of executable telephony events comprise at least one of answering an incoming call, ignoring an incoming call, and discontinuing an incoming call (column 6, line 63 to column 7, line 5, where the system may be setup for forwarding phone calls).

11. Claims 11, 13, 14, and 16-19 are substantially the same as claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-9, directed toward a system rather than a method. uReach inherently uses a system containing devices such that the mobile device and PC may connect, send, and receive messages. Therefore, system claims 11, 13, 14, and 16-19 are rejected under the same basis as method claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-9.

12. Claims 5 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over uReach as applied to claim 1 above, further in view of US 2002/0194331, Lewis et al.

13. As per claim 5, uReach does not expressly teach the use of a UDP connection. Lewis teaches a method and system for call notification wherein:

the notification is forwarded to the second device directly over a UDP/IP based connection (paragraph 22, where the system uses voice over IP (VoIP), which is commonly known in the art to use the UDP protocol to send messages).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the UDP protocol as Lewis over the Web such as in the system as taught by uReach or that of Roeder. Roeder's system allows the use of computers acting as telephones (column 6, lines 28-29), which is commonly known in the art to be VoIP, utilizing UDP. UDP is known in the art as an alternative to TCP for message delivery, and it would have been obvious to try from a finite number of identified, predictable solution, with a reasonable expectation of success. UDP, as well known in the art, offers faster and more efficient transfer, but does not provide delivery guarantees such as that of TCP. Thus, for the predictable and well known result of faster and more efficient transport, it would have been obvious to use UDP.

14. Claim 15 is substantially the same as claim 5 directed toward a system rather than a method. Lewis teaches a system as well as a method (title). Therefore, system claim 15 is rejected under the same basis as method claim 5.

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US 7 487 294, Asthana et al teaches a system for accessing information services from a mobile device.

US 7 304 983, Simpson et al teaches a system for enhancing internet call-waiting.

US 7 103 167, Brahm et al teaches a system for call screening.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to THOMAS RICHARDSON whose telephone number is (571) 270-1191. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 8am-5pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Vaughn can be reached on (571) 272-3922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TR
/William C. Vaughn, Jr./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2444